THE CHRISTIAN EAST

VOL. II. NEW SERIES. NO. 1 SPRING, 1952

SOME ASPECTS OF THE CONTEMPLATIVE LIFE OR "HESYCHIA" ACCORDING TO ST. GREGORY PALAMAS

(continued from Vol. I, No. 6, pp. 178–187)

FROM what has been said it is clear that Palamas held very sound principles about the relations between body and soul—principles which he developed with wonderful beauty of language in *Prosopopieia*.[1] He even mitigated very greatly the stern ascetic ideas of his teacher Gregory the Sinaite.[2] According to Palamas, the glory of the regenerated and deified soul is reflected upon the flesh also, which is reformed and lifted up to enjoy with the soul the divine communion.[3] Although Palamite Hesychia represents the highest degree of the ascetic life in its historic development, still its asceticism is not of the rigid type. It is remarkable that Palamas was not even opposed to the enjoyment of the pleasures of this life in so far as they are used in moderation, and are not obstacles to the life of prayer and to the Vision of God. On the contrary, Palamas taught that we must use even worldly pleasures as "matter and occasion for the ascent to God."[4] This is indeed a very healthy mysticism, in close conformity with the Pauline doctrine that "Every creature of God is good, and nothing to be refused if it be received with thanksgiving."[5] Palamas would even consider it a great privilege of man to have been endowed by God with bodily senses. Through the linking of bodily senses with the rational soul, man has invented a multitude of arts and sciences, and can create "out of nothing"—only not absolutely "out of nothing," since this is the work of God alone; so that he adds, as in anticipation of the theories of later physical science about the "indestructibility of matter," that "Nothing new comes into being, nor is anything destroyed, but one thing being compounded with another is presented under a new form."[6]

III

The third basic characteristic of Palamite Hesychia is prayer, which is the centre and proper work of the Hesychastic life. Hesychia is nothing other than a method of pure and perfect prayer. Both the features already mentioned—retirement from the world, and self-concentration of mind—

[1] Lately the genuineness of *Prosopopieia* has been disputed. It has been attributed, but without sufficient reason, to Michael Choniates. See G. Stadtmuller in *Orientalia Christiana*, Vol. 33, 1934; also Papamichael, *op. cit.*, p. 218.
[2] Cf. Papamichael, *op. cit.*, p. 80.
[3] P.G. 150, 1113. Cf. 1 Cor. vi. 20.
[4] P.G. 150, 1117.
[5] 1 Tim. iv. 4.
[6] P.G. 150, 1165.

are the means and prerequisites for a perfect life of prayer. Those who took refuge in Hesychia were inflamed with the ardent desire to live the rest of their life in constant communion with God by prayer in solitude. Our Lord also withdrew Himself into the wilderness when He wanted to pray.[7] In the Synodical Tome issued by the Synods of A.D. 1341 in the course of the Hesychastic controversy, Hesychia is called the "Mother of Prayer."[8] All Hesychastic writers have employed passionate language in their numerous works to exalt the value of prayer.[9] Palamas, as we have already seen (No. 6, p. 180), taught that "the exercise of virtue prepares the ascetic for receptivity of the divine, but not for union with God. But the power of prayer sanctifies him, and perfects the lifting up of men towards divine union, since it is the link between the contemplating creature and the Creator." He used also to emphasize that through prayer the earth is changed into heaven, and the praying man "vies with the untiring heavenly hymnodists, becoming indeed another angel of God upon earth."[10]

The human soul acquires through prayer "unmoveableness towards evil."[11] St. Paul insisted on continual praying, and said "Pray without ceasing,"[12] or "Continue in prayer,"[13] "Praying always with all prayer and supplication in the spirit."[14] For our Hesychasts also the Alpha and Omega of the religious life was prayer. Insomuch as the believer is a child of God, inbreathed always with the Holy Spirit, it is only by continuous prayer that he can converse with his Father. The life of the saint thus becomes, according to Origen,[15] uninterrupted prayer. Even when the mystics of Mount Athos were not praying in words or mentally, their life was always in a state of prayer. Hence they describe mental prayer as "state of mind"[16] rather than as act of prayer. In such a state a man is aware of the presence of God in his life, and lives always under the shadow of His power—even as She lived for whom it was said "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee." According to the Hesychasts, the essence and basic feature of a true and full life is its praying, which unites a man to the very Life—to God—so that according to them it would be better, instead of the Cartesian *Cogito*

[7] St. Luke v. 16, vi. 12, ix. 18, xi. 1, xxii. 41.

[8] P.G. 151, 683.

[9] Many Western writers, e.g., Dean Inge in his work, *Christian Mysticism*, Friedrich Heiler in his *Das Gebet*, and others, do not mention Palamite Mysticism, or the Hesychia of the Eastern Church—possibly its vast literature was unknown to them. Only the Pseudo-Dionysius, St. Macarius, St. Simeon the New Theologian, and St. Nilus, are mentioned, and they rarely, while Gregory Palamas and Gregory the Sinaite are not even named. Some Roman Catholic writers do speak of them, but only in relation to the Hesychastic Controversy, and their conflict Barlaam the Calabrian, without paying due attention to their mystical ideas. Cf. "Kirche und Kosmos," *Orthodoxes und Evangelisches Christentum*, Studienheft, No. 2, p. 128, 1950.

[10] P.G. 150, 1081. Cf. the same saying in Heiler, *op cit.* (1919), Vorwort, s. VI, quoted from Sadhu Sundar Singh.

[11] P.G. 150, 1084.

[12] 1 Thess. v. 17;

[13] Col. iv. 2.

[14] Ephes. vi. 18.

[15] Origen, in explaining the words of St. Paul, "Pray without ceasing" says that this happens "if we regard the whole life of the saint as one uninterrupted prayer; of which prayer one part will be that which is usually called prayer." P.G. 11, 452.

[16] P.G. 150, 1081.

ergo sum, to say *Oro ergo sum*. To an activistic age like ours, this may appear as an exaggeration, a complete absorption into God. But it is just in our troubled and busy age, in which so much importance is given to social and political activity, that it is most necessary to call attention to the perils of a Christian activism divorced from Christian mysticism. After all, our primary Christian duties are not social or political, but religious, namely the worship of God "to whom we hasten," [17] and "for whom man exists." [18]

In its effort to concentrate during prayer all the powers of the soul on the contemplation of God only, Palamism has emphasized the value of "mental prayer," or "the prayer of the heart." [19] In mental prayer the faithful is "dumb and deaf" [20] to the impressions and influences of the world, and is attached to one thought only—to God. During mental prayer, the dissipation of man's fallen nature is avoided, and the soul acquires unity and simplicity having in mind God alone, whom in silent wonder he glorifies and adores. This mental prayer (*oratio mentalis, oratio spiritualis*) was called "monologistic" prayer, since the soul is concentrated on the contemplation of God alone. Through self-concentration, contemplation of God becomes possible.

The religious experience of concentrating the mind within itself led the Hesychasts to the use of the Jesus prayer—the invocation, "Jesus Christ, have mercy upon us." The continual invocation of the Name of our Lord expresses the Christocentric mysticism of Hesychia, which, as is well-known, has its roots in St. Paul.[21] But it should not be supposed that the constant invocation of the Name of Jesus was an abstract, monotonous prayer, empty of content, or a "formless vacuity." On the contrary, it was an uninterrupted communion with the living Christ, and a constant watchfulness over the movements of the soul under Christ's presence. In the Name of Christ [22] all temptations and the enemies of the human soul were repulsed. "With the Name of Jesus whip all enemies; since there is no stronger weapon in heaven and upon earth," says St. John of the Ladder.[23] Again the continual invocation of the Name did not mean name-worship, or idolatry of magic words, because its power lies not in the words, but in the continual "remembrance of God," [24] and in the ceaseless awareness of His presence in the mind. Thus the Jesus prayer was a way of concentrating the soul in God through Jesus Christ.[25]

In their effort to use all possible ways for concentrating the mind on the vision of God through prayer, the mystics of Mount Athos had the custom of bowing the face down during prayer, and fixing the eyes upon the breast,

[17] P.G. 150, 934.
[18] P.G. 150, 1012.
[19] P.G. 147, 64 (John of the Ladder); 34, 527 (St. Macarius); 150, 1277 (Gregory Sinaita).
[20] P.G. 150, 1080 (Palamas); 147, 761 (Nilus). "Strive to keep the mind in time of prayer deaf and dumb, and thus you will be able to pray."
[21] P.G. 150, 1120 (Palamas).
[22] Cf. the usual expression of St. Paul, "in the name of our Lord Jesus"—1 Cor. v. 4, vi. 11, Ephes. v. 20, Phil. ii. 9, Col. iii. 17, etc.
[23] P.G. 150, 1316.
[24] P.G. 150, 1308 (Gregory Sinaita).
[25] Cf. "On the Invocation of the Name of Jesus," by a monk of the Eastern Church (published by the Fellowship of SS. Alban and Sergius).

where is the heart, the seat of all thoughts and of all passions. Through this external bodily attitude those at least who were still novices in the contemplative life found help for concentrating their mind in the interior of the soul and on God, although Palamas said that even the perfect employed such methods of prayer—" Even Elijah," he said, " who was most perfect in the vision of God, leaned his head on his knees, and thus more sedulously concentrating the mind within itself and on God, he stopped the drought which had lasted so many years." [26]

IV

We now have to examine the last basic feature of Palamism, its teaching about illumination by the Divine and Uncreated Light. In all forms of mysticism, the final stage on the way to union with God and deification is illumination. But Palamism formulated (it did not invent it) the teaching about deification by the Uncreated Light, and can therefore be characterized as Light Mysticism. By prayer the soul is cleansed from every passion, and from worldly things, and attains to the contemplation of God. In the stages of self-concentration the man is still active, performing affective acts. In contemplation he ceases to act, and only sees. In their contemplation, said the Hesychasts, it came about that they saw a great light, which filled them with joy and peace. The sight of this Light constitutes the blessedness of the elect. But this ineffable Light is God Himself, who is conceived as Light—a representation of God not alien either to the Old Testament (cf. the Shechinah filling the Tabernacle of the Lord, Exod. xl. 34–38) or to the New Testament, where it is clearly said that " God is Light " (1 John i. 5). The Hesychasts nourished the belief in the possibility of a man's seeing this Light during prayer. In the Synodical Tome mentioned above, we read that " Hesychia is mother of prayer: and prayer is manifestation of the Divine Glory." [27] According to St. Macarius during pure prayer " Thy soul becomes all a spiritual eye, and all Light." [28] This divine illumination is nothing else than the action of God upon the soul, the Divine Grace, or the Glory of the Essence of God, communicated to the worthy.[29] This Light enlightens the interior of the soul, and man is made by it like to God, and is deified—that is to say, he acquires the fullness of life. Assimilation to God, and perfection of the soul, said Palamas, " is achieved only through the divine illumination from God." [30] Inasmuch as we are children of God, " the children must be in accordance with the Father, gods from God and spiritual from the Spirit." [31] This deification of man is a doctrine general among the Greek Fathers, who taught that man, created in the image and likeness of God, did not at the Fall lose or quench the Image of God within himself, but deformed it by sins and passions, and deprived himself of the Divine Light and the likeness of God. " All have sinned and come short of the glory of God," says St. Paul (Rom. iii. 23). " While we lost the Divine likeness, we do not lose the Divine Image," says Palamas.[32] Through pure mental prayer the faithful receives

[26] P.G. 150, 1113, 1116; 1 Kings xviii. 42.
[27] P.G. 151, 683.
[28] P.G. 34, 461.
[29] P.G. 150, 1288.
[30] P.G. 150, 1168.
[31] P.G. 150, 1305.
[32] P.G. 150, 1148, 1168.

SAFETY FILM

the Divine and Uncreated Light, which purifies him from all evils, and so he is assimilated to God, and deified, the Divine Image within him being restored to its first splendour.

This contemplation of God, and deification by the Uncreated Light, is not in contradiction of the other belief of mystics, that God is invisible and unapproachable. The antinomy is removed by the distinction drawn by Palamas between the Divine Essence and the Divine Operations (ἐνεργείαι). In the state of illumination, we do not see or participate in the Divine Essence, which is indeed invisible, uncommunicable, unknowable, simple, but in the Divine Light or Grace, which is a Divine Operation. One who is enlightened by the Divine Uncreated Light becomes "deiform," like God, but not identical with God in Essence, as would be the case if the operations of the Divine Essence were not distinguished from that Essence itself. The Essence of God is one and simple, but its Operations are numberless and communicable. They are "forthcomings (πρόοδοι) and manifestations" [33] of the Divine Essence, because God is "from eternity operative and all-powerful," having His powers and operations before all creation (προαιωνίως).[34] Thus the Divine Operations are eternal, that is to say, uncreated: and those who receive the Divine Light, which is an Operation of the Divine Essence, receive the Deity itself: "We become gods all in all, except in identity of substance," [35] said St. Maximus, quoted by Palamas, who also quotes St. Athanasius as saying, "In His deifying Grace, God is both seen and communicated to the worthy: but in His Essence He is incommunicable." [36] A created divine grace could not deify. But according to the teaching of Palamas, the Divine Grace and all the Divine Operations are eternal and immaterial and uncreated, and therefore can deify the human nature. "It is not God's Operation, but that which it operates and accomplishes, that is a creature." [37] The "forthcomings" of the Divine Essence—the Divine Operations—are the means by which God is revealed and communicated to man and to the world. They are absolute and eternal "forthcomings" and communications—if they were created, they would not be absolute.

The soul regenerated by the Divine Light acquires "spiritual senses" (νοερὰς αἰσθήσεις) by which she can contemplate the ultimate rational ground (λόγος) of all that is and appears, the supercosmic realities. The soul thus deified "knows by spiritual sense," [38] said Palamas. And while, in the state of contemplation, she sees and knows nothing of worldly things, she knows God, and "sees the things invisible." [39] The place of the reason is taken by the spiritual eyes, which the Divine Light purifies and opens. And while the Barlaamites, Palamas's opponents, maintained that the knowledge of God and supercosmic things can be achieved by means of the intellect, Palamas held that it is only possible by way of illumination by the

[33] P.G. 150, 1172.
[34] Ibid.
[35] P.G. 150, 936.
[36] Ibid.
[37] P.G. 150, 172.
[38] P.G. 150, 1120.
[39] P.G. 150, 1081.

Divine Light, and mystical union with God. It is a knowledge achieved through love and union, and is in proportion to the measure of illumination and love. "Being through pure prayer raised outside themselves, and having been taken into God through mystical union with Him, the saints have been initiated into the mysteries above mind" (τὰ ὑπὲρ νοῦν ἐμυήθησαν), said Palamas,[40] who says also that "Those who partake of this illumination, have in proportion to the measure thereof knowledge of the things that are." [41] To such a height of living does the Hesychast attain in his prayer when he is enlightened with the Divine Light, and filled with the Divine Grace and Love.

St. Gregory Palamas was a "Hesychast," a man of prayer. And only the necessity of defending the Hesychastic life obliged him to formulate theologically and philosophically what he lived in prayer and in contemplation. The theoretical development and formulation sprang from the experience of the life in prayer. It has been well said that the significance and value of Palamism lay in this, that it set Hesychastic mysticism firmly upon a dogmatic basis.[42] In Palamism we have a synthesis of rationalism with mysticism: but the dominating element therein is the mysticism, because the thought is purely religious, based first on religious experience—on the prayer-life of men inflamed with the desire for contemplation of God and union with Him; and secondly on the doctrine and tradition of the Fathers. This was why it finally prevailed, and the foundations of Christian mysticism were preserved. So in speaking about Palamism we must bear in mind that we are not concerned with a work of the intellect, but with a life of prayer, with an urge and disposition towards communion with God. Thought here is strengthened and enlightened by piety and prayer. Hence we see even uneducated Hesychasts, like Symeon the New Theologian,[43] speaking with power about great problems of religion and theology. Palamism reflects the effort of the Byzantine soul to reach the Divine in all its purity through prayer and contemplation. It is also a method of perfection through prayer, and has outward means of concentrating the mind within itself and on God: but chiefly it deals with the inner life of man, and its relation with the infinite and invisible God. It expresses the struggle of the religious soul to be united with the source of its own life, and to enjoy already in this present life the blessedness that is in God. It expresses the desire of the mind and of the heart to overleap their own imperfections, to be exalted above themselves, and to be united with God.[44]

BASIL IOANNIDES.

[40] P.G. 150, 1228 (Palamas); 120, 321 (Symeon the New Theologian).

[41] P.G. 150, 1168.

[42] Cf. "La Philosophie Byzantine," par Basile Tatakis, p. 273 (in the series, *Histoire de la Philosophie*, ed. Emile Brehier, 1949); also Kosmos und Kirche, op. cit., Studienheft, No. 2, p. 128.

[43] Symeon the New Theologian was regarded by the Barlaamites and others as the chief spiritual father of Hesychasm: cf. P.G. 154, 180.

[44] On Palamism the author made a communication also to the International Congress of Byzantine Studies at Palermo, April 3–10, 1951.

[This Encyclical, issued in December 1951, should be of general interest to the readers of *The Christian East*. Coming from the ancient seat of the New Rome, it exhibits the ever-new vitality of the Eastern Orthodox Church faced with the problems of to-day.]

AN ENCYCLICAL FROM THE ECUMENICAL PATRIARCH ATHENAGORAS

BY THE GRACE OF GOD ARCHBISHOP OF CONSTANTINOPLE, "NEW ROME," AND ECUMENICAL PATRIARCH

TO THE WHOLE COMPANY OF THE CHURCH GRACE AND PEACE FROM GOD.

THE Divine Christ, Founder, Perfecter and Eternal Governor of the Holy Church, when He departed to His Heavenly Father, wishing to make good what was lacking from His bodily presence, sent the Paraclete, the Spirit of Truth, to dwell with it for ever and lead it into all truth.

The Divine Apostles, enlightened and empowered by this Spirit, preached everywhere that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the Living God, and "neither is there salvation in any other" (Acts iv. 12).

Of this faith, taught and revealed by God, in the divinity of Jesus Christ as the Incarnate Word of God, the successors of the Apostles, the holy Fathers of the Church, were inspired exponents and continuators: both preaching and writing what has been received from them, and formulating and propagating under God's guidance in Ecumenical Synods the dogmatic teaching of the Church in this chief foundation of the Faith.

Blessed be God, who has shown His Church to be the pillar and stronghold of the truth, and wisely endowed it, in that He has seen fit that we too, devout sons of the Church, should celebrate to-day, with grateful and exultant heart, the revered 1500th anniversary of one of the most notable of Ecumenical Councils, the 4th of Chalcedon, whose declarations, both as definitions and as canons, preserved the Orthodox faith, and gave such an especial impetus to the fortunes of our Orthodox East.

This renowned and historic anniversary is rightly revered by our most Holy Apostolic and Ecumenical Throne, which sees in the work of this synod the inestimable fruit of the sacred Hierarchy of the East, and God's seal upon the loving care, the sacred labours which it has spent upon the faith as upon its ecclesiastical order and organization.

Let us rejoice together, beloved children in the Lord, and as we gaze in the spirit of humility on the counsel of God as it is recorded in history, let us appropriate the sacred teachings presented by those historical events, which we bring to your notice through our Patriarchal and Synodical Encyclical.

Now of the problems that have from time to time engaged theological speculation none has disturbed the Church so deeply as the heretical propositions about the Person of our Lord Jesus Christ and the vision in Him of Two Natures, the Divine and the Human, which were fostered with unpardonable patience and persistence, sporadically from the beginnings of the third century and after the fourth more frequently, by men of most discerning spirit and most freely endowed with philosophical and dialectical gifts. An unbroken chain is formed by the names of those heresiarchs

Arius and Macedonius, Apollinarius and Sabellius, Euromius and Dioscorus and Nestorious. But there is also the whole company of heroes in the true faith whom the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church arrayed against them—Athanasius the Great, Gregory the Theologian, Cyril of Alexandria, Leo of Rome and the thousand other inspired Fathers and Teachers who drew the power of their words from revealed truth and set up a triumphal arch of the right faith to the glory of Christ.

Amongst the heresiarchs and after them the author and exponent of the heresy most closely associated with the present festival was Eutyches, priest of the Church of Constantinople, and archimandrite of one of the monasteries at Byzantium. In opposition to Nestorius, advocate of the philosophical " Double Principle," who extolled the two natures to the detriment of the unity of the person and accepted only an ethical " conjunction " of the human and Divine nature, Eutyches taught that the body which the Lord assumed at the Incarnation was a body not consubstantial with that of His Mother Mary and with ours, but of another kind appropriate to His Divinity. " Till to-day I never said that the body of our Lord and God was consubstantial with us. . . . I confess that our Lord was begotten of two natures before the union, but after the union I confess one nature," he revealed before the Patriarch Flavian and the Fathers assembled to judge him at the Synod of 448. The Local Synod degraded and exited Eutyches who would not conform to its demands that he should forswear and anathematize his monophysite heresy; but all other ecclesiastical conventions confirmed him and his followers so that thanks to their Patrons the Synod of Ephesus in 449, rightly known as the " Robber Synod," meeting under the presidency of Dioscuros of Alexandria, not only exonerated Eutyches but also pronounced the deposition of the Patriarch Flavian through force and intimidation.

Let no one think, beloved children in the Lord, that the Christological question and the long and bitter strife that waged around it was a theoretical question of secondary importance: nor that the discussions involved were merely quests for words and philosophical terms, as at first sight it might appear. The discussions affected the primary and fundamental truth that forms the very core and basis of the whole Christian faith. For if our Lord Jesus Christ was not incarnate God, that is complete God and complete man, like as in all things, without sin: if the two natures, Divine and human, were not united in the Person or hypostasis of the Son of God in a way that did not detract from the peculiar properties of each nature, the whole economy of the salvation of the human race in Christ would have collapsed, in that in either contingency Christ could not have fulfilled the demands of Divine justice, nor have purified man from the stain of sin, nor have regenerated him to newness of life, leading him to eternal glory and revealing him heir of God.

It was the fundamental importance of the Christological Dogma, and its perversion, together with the dangers arising from any inclination of the Church in a diophysite or monophysite direction, that led the new emperor Marcian, a good and pious Christian, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, and at the instigation of this venerable Ecumenical Church in the

East, to convene the fourth Ecumenical Council in the autumn of 451 at the sacred site of Chalcedon. At this Holy Synod, six hundred and thirty fathers, coming together from the ends of the earth, held their conferences in the Church of the Holy and Renowned Martyr Euphemia, to discuss with steadfast faith and pious interest under the revealing light of the Holy Gospel and right Tradition. On the heresiarch Eutyches they passed anathema, and the orthodox faith was formulated in the following inspired Definition of faith: "Therefore, following the holy fathers, we all with one accord teach man to acknowledge one and the same Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, at once complete in Godhead and complete in manhood, truly God and truly man, consisting also of a reasonable soul and body; consubstantial with the Father as regards His Godhead, and at the same time consubstantial with us as regards His manhood; like us in all respects, apart from sin . . . one and the same Christ, Son, Lord, Only-begotten, recognized in two natures, without confusion, without change, without Division, without separation; the distinction of natures being in no way annulled by the union, but rather the characteristics of each nature being preserved and coming together to form one person and hypostasis." This Definition read from the pulpit of the church by the archdeacon at the seventh and last meeting of the Council on October 25th, 451, in the presence of the most pious princes and the Divine Fathers of the Council. It was acclaimed with a shout that justified unmistakably to the great joy of the clergy and whole assembly at the confirmation yet again of the faith and truth taught by God to the One Church.

Naturally this inspired declaration of the Council offered hope of calm and peace to the Church inasmuch as her unity in the Christological faith was officially and triumphantly formulated while her power to defend the truth entrusted to her was made abundantly evident. But this hope was quickly dissipated. No long time passed before opposition to its declaration reared its head. The condemned Monophysites, who held a majority in Egypt and Syria, emerged once more threatening to arouse again religious passions. This opposition had dire results not only for the church: for these places, with the peoples within their sphere of influence, were alienated and in time cut off from the body of the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church, consequently both involving themselves in great tribulation and grievously afflicting the Church of Christ through their separation.

To allay the suffering of the Church from the loss of members dear to her, the unsearchable wisdom of God at work in history willed another means of reinforcement. The Holy Spirit, who had guided the Holy Fathers of the Council in resolving and directing the Christological Dogma, led the same Fathers to another way, just as wonderful, of securing the broken unity of the Church by establishing the position of the bishop of this royal city of Constantine, New Rome.

The position of the Church of Constantinople, beloved children in the Lord, during the years immediately before the Synod had a peculiar importance and pre-eminence throughout the then Christian world. The West, in full acknowledgment of the importance which accrued to this Church

from the presence of the emperor and his council, kept its attention turned towards the East, working in close co-operation with it especially in matters concerning the faith. Moreover, the three previous Ecumenical Councils, the first at Nicæa, the second at Constantinople, and the third at Ephesus, had brought the West thronging to the East. The whole East welcomed the protecting arm of the Church honoured by King and council. Round the Bishop of this Church gathered the Hierarchs of the Eastern Themes, whether invited or even resident, for the solution of serious ecclesiastical problems, and the decisions they took had canonical and obligatory authority for all. To him, in time, the Exarchs of Thrace, Pontus and Asia gave their allegiance, and to him turned the other Eastern patriarchates in their several new ecclesiastical circumstances.

This quite new situation was reviewed by the fourth Ecumenical Council which defined and regulated the precedence it demanded in canons 9 and 17, while in the 28th Canon the extent of the jurisdiction executed by this most Holy Ecumenical Throne and its position as pre-eminent over the whole Eastern Church was assured. "For ever following the lines laid down by the Holy Fathers," they say in the 28th Canon of the Council, "and in acknowledgment of the canon of the one hundred and fifty most gracious Bishops, gathered to honour the memory of Theodosius the Great, crowned in the royal city of Constantine, New Rome, we make the same decree defining the seniority of the most Holy Church of this very city of Constantine, New Rome. For the Fathers gave a natural seniority to the Throne of the elder Rome when that city rules the Empire. And now with the same object the hundred and fifty most gracious bishops have awarded equal seniority to the most Holy Throne of the New Rome, rightly judging that city honoured by emperor and council, which enjoys equal seniority with the elder Rome, should also enjoy similar privileges in matters ecclesiastical, it being counted second after her. And so the metropolitans of the Dioceses of Pontus, Asia and Thrace, with those bishops of the forenamed Dioceses in occupied territories should be ordained by the forenamed most holy Throne of the most holy Church of Constantinople; that is, each metropolitan of the forenamed Dioceses with the bishops of the province ordaining new bishops in the province, in accordance with the holy canons; and as has been said, the metropolitans of the forenamed dioceses are to be ordained by the archbishop of Constantinople, when the election has been agreed upon according to custom and the votes cast for him."

Both clergy and laity praised and glorified the beneficent name of God, the revered assembly of the Fathers and the pious rulers gathered to witness the authoritative presentation of the highest privileges to this most Holy Throne.

And to this honour, as to a Decree of God's providence, the most Holy Throne of the city of Constantine has worthily responded.

The Patriarch Anatolius of blessed memory, himself the first to embrace the privilege with which this canon endowed the Throne, regarded it not as a means to satisfying ambitions or a stepping-stone to ecclesiastical imperialism, but as a corner-stone well fitted to the building of the body

of a Church sorely troubled by heresies and schisms. And the continual practice of the Church since then testifies that our most Holy Ecumenical Throne has even believed in and fulfilled its peaceful mission. From its faith it has never nor does it ever depart, but as in a spirit of love and conciliation it has from the first faced the tensions exerted by the West, so, also to-day it works out its destiny in the same spirit in its relations with the sister Churches.

And now on this notable occasion of the 1500th anniversary of this revered Council of Chalcedon, we lovingly turn especially to those brothers separated since the time of that Council, who, in the words of John of Damascus, "have by the decision of the Council of Chalcedon cut themselves off from the Church while in all else remaining orthodox," and who, even they, have our esteem and affection, as brothers. In the same spirit of love we also send our heartfelt greeting in the Lord on this sacred anniversary to all the Churches of Christ. It is now time to lift every barrier to the *rapprochement* and unity that is to be attained through common and sustained effort, for which, we assure all men, our most Holy Ecumenical Throne will extend the greatest good will, sympathy and assistance.

Zealous and blessed children of the Church.

Since under the grace of Almighty God it has been our lot to celebrate in this historic place the sacred anniversary of this great Council, let us both render thanks and honour to the God worshipped in Trinity and also steadfastly believe that the prayer of our Lord "that all may be one" will become a fact, while we ourselves must co-operate with this prayer, striving to keep the unity of the faith in the bond of peace, confessing "One Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all and through all, and in us all." To whom be glory and dominion for ever and ever. Amen.

December 16, 1951.

✢ Of Constantinople, Athenagoras,
with Christ's blessing.

451—1951
THOUGHTS OF AN ANGLICAN

IN the period immediately previous to the sixteenth century, the English religious courts, in common with the other religious courts of Western Europe, were obliged to accept the judgments of the "curia" or court of the Roman see in matters concerning heresy. When the separation between the Church of England and the Roman Church had taken place it was necessary for the English authorities to find a new definition of the term "heresy," and in doing so they seem to have been influenced by the Roman civil law as it was codified by the Emperor Justinian. They adopted the "civilian" definition of heresy as anything declared to be heresy by the first four General Councils or by any one of them. An act of the English parliament, passed in 1559, forbids the spiritual courts in England to pronounce to be heresy "any matter or cause," unless it had already been pronounced to be heresy either, "by the authority of the canonical Scrip-

tures," or "by the first four General Councils," or "by any other general Council," in which it was "declared to be heresy by the express and plain words" of the Holy Scriptures. Provision was then made for a future definition of heresy by the parliament of England with the assent of the English clergy in their local synods of convocations; but this was never done, so that the definition of heresy from the point of view of the English spiritual courts is still to this day a doctrine which is either against the Holy Scriptures, in their plain and literal sense, or condemned as a heresy by the Councils of Nicæa, Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon.

It is not my purpose here to consider at any length the reasons why the later Ecumenical Synods were not mentioned in this definition of heresy. It is a very curious fact that the English of the sixteenth century were so ignorant of the history of the Greek Church after the period of the Council of Chalcedon that they could write, in one of the "Homilies" authorized for reading in church in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, that the Greek Church rejected, "even to this day," the second Council of Nicæa. They seem to have believed that the second Council of Nicæa ordered the use of statues in churches and ordered that statues should be adored with "latreia." Thus they rejected that council, as contrary to the Holy Scriptures, contrary to the ancient fathers of the Church, and not genuinely a General Council. They regarded the fifth and sixth councils, when they mentioned them, as supplementary to the third and fourth councils. But they were inclined to think of the period of the "corruptions of the Church," which the Reformation sought to uproot, as having begun in the century after the Council of Chalcedon. Having very little contact indeed with the Eastern Churches they made their distinction, not between the common teaching of East and West on the one hand and the teachings peculiar to the West on the other hand, but rather between the teaching of the Fathers of the first five centuries and the teaching of the medieval scholastic theologians. Even now the influence of this conception of the first five centuries persists in the programme of the Honours School of theology at the university of Oxford, as the students are required to study the history of Christian dogma in the period ending with the Council of Chalcedon in 451, making a special study of the dogmatic definitions of the first four General Councils. The Chalcedonian definition is often regarded as the "terminus ad quem" of the growth of the theology of the ancient undivided Church. From the point of view of science this has certain very serious disadvantages. It has retarded and diverted to a small group of specialists the study of the history of Eastern Christendom after Chalcedon. It has encouraged among Anglicans and perhaps among others the idea that the East became stationary in the fifth century. It is nevertheless important, from the point of view of the movement for the reunion of the Christian Church, that the Anglican Church defined heresy in terms of Scripture and the first four General Councils, rather than in terms of Scripture and some distinctively Anglican formulary.

Chalcedon has a certain attraction for the Anglican, who sees in the definition of the council the "Via Media," between the two heresies of Nestorius and Eutyches and between the extremes of the Antiochian and

Alexandrian schools, just as he sees in the way of the Church of England after the Reformation, the "Via Media" between Papalism and the Continental Reformation. The last sentence of the definition is often regarded as a kind of symbol of "comprehensiveness," in that it is said to forbid the Church to require from catechumens the profession of any doctrine not contained in the Nicene Creed. There are some who believe that all dogmatic definition ought to have ended at Chalcedon. It was not the intention of the council to issue a "definition to end definitions." No formula is self-explanatory or incapable of being misunderstood in a heretical sense. But there is among Anglicans a very strong and justifiable conviction that people ought not to be condemned as heretics without absolute necessity and that the medieval period in Church history saw many unjustifiable condemnations for heresy, of which the present divided state of the Church is the consequence.

In Jerusalem in the year 1951 we are looking at the Council of Chalcedon from another point of view. Our attention is drawn chiefly to the decision of the council through which the Mother of all the Churches became one of the Patriarchates. In a treatise of the twelfth century known as the "Tractatus Eboracensis," an English cleric denied that the Roman Church could rightly claim the title of "The Mother of all the Churches" because that name belonged to Jerusalem. But as far as the West was concerned this opinion was almost isolated and, even in the East, the claims of Jerusalem have not been regarded as the chief answer to the claims of Rome. No one has ever suggested that it was necessary for a true Catholic to be in communion with the Church of Jerusalem or that the doctrine of the local Church of Jerusalem must, in the nature of things, be the true doctrine of the Church of Christ. In the third and fourth centuries the Bishop of Jerusalem was simply one of the bishops of the province in Syria of which Cæsarea was the chief see. From the fifth century onwards he has been one of the Patriarchs, but he has adhered to the doctrine of the essential equality of the Patriarchs. The special position of Jerusalem in the Church is due neither to the political importance of the city nor to the number of the Christian population in the city and the surrounding area nor even to the theological or spiritual eminence of any holder of the see. It is due solely to the existence of the Holy Places in Jerusalem and its neighbourhood. There is a connection between the Chalcedonian definition and the importance of the Holy Places. The importance of the Chalcedonian definition lies in its assertion of what modern theologians call "the scandal of particularity." Events in space and time which can only be known through historical records are asserted to be the key to the mystery of the universe. God acts in history at one particular time and in one particular place. The heresies which deny or minimize the reality of the humanity of Christ may be seen to contain a tendency to minimize this particularity; if allowed to develop they might have assimilated the Gospel to those myths about the gods which could be regarded as allegories representing a timeless reality. In asserting the act of God in history the Chalcedonian definition said "No" to this tendency. It is most appropriate that the same council should have raised the guardian of the Holy Places to patriarchal rank.

Since the events of the Gospel story took place in time and space it is natural that believers wish to know exactly where each event really happened. For sixteen hundred years and more, men and women from all over the world have come to the Holy Places, in order to realize that the Incarnate Word was " in loco," in particular places, and in order to pray in the light of that realization. The Holy Places contributed much to the growth of the Christian Liturgy, especially in connection with the drama of the Christian year. It may be said, with perfect truth, that the authenticity of a great many of them is doubtful. Humanly speaking, it is impossible to point to a particular square inch of ground and say that it is " The Place " where the cross stood, or where a particular figure in the divine drama stood. In most cases, what is pointed out to pilgrims is a spot chosen as a " focus of attention," for the contemplation of an event, in the region in which it is believed that the event took place. But the regions, or the sites of churches chosen in the fourth century, do not seem to have been chosen arbitrarily. For example, the Church of the Resurrection, sometimes called the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, containing both Golgotha and the tomb of Christ, was built on a site which certainly included several tombs of a Jewish type, a spur of rock torn by an earthquake, and remains of ancient buildings which could easily suggest that the whole was just outside the walls of the city destroyed by Titus. Some of the tombs found, or rather parts of them, exist in their original condition in the chapel used by the Syrians and under the floor of the Coptic monastery. The ancient buildings, resembling city walls and a fortified gate, south-east of the traditional Golgotha, are to be seen in the Alexander Hospice belonging to the Russian Palestine Society. The tomb which was identified as the tomb of Jesus Christ suffered severe damage during the eleventh century and more damage, through relic-hunters, in the medieval period. But early pilgrim records show that it was a tomb of a known Jewish type which stood where the edicule now stands, and of which remnants are embedded in the walls and floor of the edicule. Thus the traditional site must have been used for Jewish burials, must have been, at least at one time, outside the city walls, and must have presented some real evidence of authenticity to those who built the first church upon it in A.D. 324–328. Before this evidence was found it was necessary to remove a great mound of earth on which a Roman forum and temple stood; attention was drawn to this temple, as the site to be explored, by the local Christian tradition.

Many, believing that a local Christian tradition about the Holy Places existed continuously among the Christians of Jerusalem from the beginning, would assert that it was confirmed by the discoveries made in the fourth century on the spots pointed out by tradition. They would also assert that the authenticity of the Holy Places is confirmed by the spiritual blessings and the wonderful healings which God has bestowed on pilgrims in all the ages since. Others would attribute the miraculous blessings given to the simple faith of the recipients and would hold that local traditions were uncertain and ideas of archæology in the fourth century A.D. very far removed from the accurate judgments of our own time. Particularly in view of the uncertainty as to whether there were any Christians on the site of Jeru-

salem in the first part of the second century A.D., they would suspend judgment about the authenticity of almost all the Holy Places. It is the result of the particularity of the Gospel events that no certainty is possible from the human standpoint about them. We can only reach probable conclusions. In regard to our Christian belief that they really happened, historical probability is transformed into certainty by faith in the Scripture and in the Church. But in regard to the places where they happened it is not possible to assert that there has been a divine revelation to the Church. Belief in the authenticity of the Holy Places is not a question of dogma or theology. But the Holy Places represent, and in many cases meet, the pilgrim's need of a vivid realization that God in the Incarnation was,

"Contract into a span."

We come to the Holy Land to realize the reality of the Humanity of Christ who was God.

For fifteen centuries of history the Orthodox Patriarchate of Jerusalem has been making this possible for pilgrims of all nations, not by any means exclusively of the Greek-Orthodox Communion. The complicated history of the process by which the Church of the Resurrection, the Church of the Nativity, and some other Holy Places came to be used, as they are now used, by a number of different communions, has never been satisfactorily traced or described. But it seems quite clear that, even in the fourth and fifth centuries, a number of different languages were used in the churches and monasteries of Jerusalem both in teaching the pilgrims and in public worship. The separation of the Monophysites from the Chalcedonians probably brought about the existence of a few groups in the Holy City who did not recognize the authority of the Greek Patriarch and his clergy. But there seem to have been no Monophysites among the local Christian population; even to this day the representatives of the Copts, Armenians, Syrian Orthodox, and Maronites, are monks and clergy, together with a few families who came to the Holy Land. The Georgians and some Syriac-speaking groups, as well as those who came from the West before the period of the first Crusade, recognized the authority of the Greek Patriarch. Even at the present day in Greek-Orthodox services in the Holy Places various languages are used liturgically according to the needs of pilgrims and local Christians; on important occasions the Epistle and Gospel are read in Greek, Arabic, and Old Slavonic. The services in parish churches are, to a great extent, in Arabic. After the separation of the Eastern and Western Churches, and after the Crusades, the Latin Christians of the Holy Land became a distinct community. During the twelfth century, under the Latin Kingdom, they were the rulers of the country, and the principal Holy Places were under the control of the Latin Patriarch. In the thirteenth century they seem to have been reduced to a very small remnant. In the fourteenth century they came back under the leadership of the Franciscans and settled in the Place of the Last Supper on the western hill, and during the next three centuries they were struggling with the Orthodox for the control of the chief Holy Places. In comparatively modern times a certain appreciable proportion of the local Christian population has passed over from Eastern Orthodoxy to Roman Catholicism and has become either

Latin or Greek Catholic. The Greek-Orthodox Patriarchate has never wished to deny access to the Holy Places, for purposes of worship, to Christians not in full communion with the Greek Church, and seems to have permitted the use of some of the Holy Places for the liturgical worship of the non-Orthodox quite willingly at various periods in its long history. Since 1885 priests of the Anglican communion have been permitted to use the chapel of Abraham, in the Greek monastery of St. Abraham, on the roof of the shrine of Golgotha. But the possession of legal rights to the use of the Holy Places by a number of communions is another matter altogether. It developed under the ægis of the various civil rulers of the Moslem faith, who governed the city between the thirteenth century and 1917, into a matter of political and diplomatic influence exercised by various foreign powers and various influential Christian groups among the merchants and traders of the Middle East. The protectors of the Orthodox were, in the first period, the Byzantine Emperors, and later the Phanariot merchants, princes and government officials in Constantinople, as well as the Kings of Georgia and, to a certain extent, the Czars of Russia. The Armenians and other smaller groups of Eastern Christians, although they still, to this day, participate with the Orthodox in certain of the ceremonies of Holy Week in Jerusalem, and they seem to have regarded the Orthodox Patriarch for many centuries as the canonical and historical head of the Eastern Christians of the Holy Land, acquired independent rights through their wealth and their influence with various rulers of the country. The Franciscans increased their influence through the patronage of Austria and France, especially when Turkey was weak. Eventually the European Powers and Turkey agreed on the maintenance of what is called "the Status Quo," which means that the division of the Holy Places is to remain as it was in the period before the Crimean War. The Orthodox Patriarchate, which still has in its communion the numerical majority of the Christians in the Holy Land, including Transjordan as well as what used to be Palestine, retains predominance in the Holy Places. This is justified by the historical fact that the Holy Places were founded and endowed by the Byzantine Empire. The Liturgical Rite used in them before the Arab conquest was Byzantine and the principal liturgical language of the Church of Jerusalem, before and after the Arab conquest, was certainly Greek. The Latin Patriarchate was a creation of the Crusaders, even if, from the Roman Catholic point of view, it can be claimed that it is the continuation of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem which was in communion with Rome before the separation of East and West. Certainly from the Anglican standpoint, as the Eastern Orthodox cannot be regarded as schismatic or heretical, it is the Greek-Orthodox Patriarchate which must be regarded as the continuation of the original Church of the city and bishopric of Jerusalem.

It is for that reason that the Anglican bishopric in Jerusalem occupies a unique position in the Anglican Communion. It has never been officially asserted that there is, or could ever be, an Anglican bishopric *of* Jerusalem. The very suggestion that such a bishopric of Jerusalem was to be founded called forth the protests of the Oxford theologians in connection with the

"Anglo-Prussian" bishopric of 1841. The Churches of the Anglican family, even though not recognized by the Eastern Orthodox as branches of the Holy Catholic Church, regard the Eastern Orthodox Patriarchates and Autocephalous Churches as canonical branches of the Holy Catholic Church, with the same legitimate rights and claims as those which the Church of England and the Churches in communion with her claim to have. Thus the Church of England claims to be the sole legitimate and canonical Church in England. The Roman Catholic community in England is, in the Anglican view, a body which separated from the Church of England after the Reformation. Similarly, the Orthodox Patriarchate of Jerusalem is, from the Anglican point of view, the sole legitimate and canonical Church in the region in which the Council of Chalcedon gave it patriarchal jurisdiction. Other Christian communities in the Holy Land are not organized in accordance with the rules of the Catholic Church in the degree in which they are separated from the Church of the country. A distinction should be made between non-proselytizing colonies of foreign Christian residents in a country and groups of local Christians who have separated themselves from the local Church. The function of the Anglican bishopric in Jerusalem is, first and foremost, to provide spiritual ministrations to members of Anglican Churches residing temporarily or permanently in the Holy Land (and in certain neighbouring regions) and to establish and develop spiritual relationships with the Orthodox Church. It is impossible, on Anglican principles, for the Anglican Church in the Near East to adopt the functions which belong to the Church of the country, or to seek to undermine the authority of the Church of the country. It needs to be remembered that the separation between the Orthodox and Anglican Churches is not the result of a direct conflict between them; it results from the fact that, at different periods and in different circumstances, they both came into conflict with the Church of Rome. When the Eastern Patriarchates and Rome "drifted apart" there was no occasion for the East to consider the conflicts which might, in a future period, arise in the West; Rome was regarded as representing the West as a whole. When the English were parted from Rome, England had no chance to make contact with the East and went her own way, ignoring rather than rejecting the East. Thus Anglicans (in their capacity as Anglicans, whatever their individual views may be) have no need to regard themselves as opponents of the Orthodox Church of the East.

Anglicans in the Near East, in defending their non-proselytizing policy, have had occasion to lay stress on the "indigenous" nature of the Orthodox Church, and this emphasis can sometimes give rise to misunderstandings. In Anglican terminology, the Orthodox Church is "The Church of the country, as the Church of England is in England." This does not necessarily imply that the Orthodox Church is the Church of the nation living in the country. The Holy Land has never been a national state in the Christian era, and there has never been at any time a Palestinian national Christian Church. The Christians living in the Holy Land have always been of more than one nationality; they have always included an important Greek element. Christians from regions outside the Holy Land

have come to live there in every century of the Christian era; those among them who were Orthodox became members of the Orthodox Church of Jerusalem, in the sense that they were subject to her jurisdiction, and were employed in her service in accordance with her own rules. Similarly an American Episcopalian living in England is a member of the Church of England. With a few exceptions the Patriarchs of Jerusalem have all been Greeks born outside Palestine; that does not necessarily affect the indigenous character of the Church of Jerusalem (throughout her history) any more than the fact that most of the Australian bishops are of the United Kingdom by origin affects the Australian character of the Church of the Commonwealth of Australia. One Archbishop of Canterbury was a Greek, several were Frenchmen or Scots, and in the future some may be American, or even Indian. This does not in any way affect the claim of the Church of England to be, in England, the Church of the country. From the Anglican standpoint, since the time of the Reformation, the conception of an "indigenous" Church has tended to include the idea that the Church ought not to introduce into any country with Christianity a foreign language or foreign customs. Thus the Episcopalian or "Anglican" Churches in China, Japan, India, etc., claim to be both "Catholic" and "National"; they do not seek to be English institutions, although they inevitably inherit from the English-speaking missionaries who founded them some elements of an "ethos" which has been developed in the historical life of the British and American peoples. But there is very little true comparison between these very young Churches and the oldest group of Churches. The struggle for the Greek character of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem, whatever view we may take of it, is not based on the introduction of a foreign culture into the Holy Land, where there were Greeks in great numbers long before the country became an Arab country. Hellenization came before the spread of Christianity, for the Christians were a very small minority before the fourth century A.D. They were a majority during the period, between the fourth century and the seventh century, when the Holy Land continued to be part of the Roman state and its people, being Roman citizens, were "Romaioi." The Orthodox of the Holy Land, although Arabianized in speech and customs to some extent, have ever since been "Romaioi" or "Rum," and have been thus regarded as part of the community to which the people of the Byzantine Empire belonged and to which the Holy Places, as Byzantine foundations, belong. The Greek people, who constitute a unity much wider than the Greek state, claim to be the continuation of the people of the Eastern Roman Empire.

Those who work and pray for the reunion of Christendom and believe that reunion involves a return to the Creed and Church constitution of the Patristic period must necessarily long for a time when the Holy Places will be recognized as "a House of Prayer for all peoples," in which all nations pray in harmony. This involves acceptance of the idea that the guardians of the Holy Places hold them as "Stewards" for Christendom. But if Christendom ever recovers the fullness of the conception of Jerusalem as the "Mother Church," Christendom will be simultaneously recognizing the full importance of the inheritance of Christian Hellenism. Just as it is

necessary for the good of theological science that all Christian theological schools should include the study of Hebrew and of Hebrew thought, it is equally necessary that Christian theological study should include Greek and Greek thought, in that the New Testament was written in Greek and the Christian creed was formulated in a Greek idiom of thought. The movement for the reunion of Christendom, at least as many of us conceive it, is a return to Greek and Hebrew roots, which must involve a new realization both of the significance of the Greek Fathers and of the significance of the Holy Land.

EDWARD EVERY.

REPORT FROM THE THEOLOGICAL ACADEMY AT HALKI

IN spite of the teaching of the ascetic Fathers on the guarding of the senses, monasteries are almost always situated in surroundings of unrivalled natural beauty. Chios, Patmos and more especially Mount Athos can all provide examples; this is also true of Halki, at one time a monastery but, since 1844, a Theological Academy with *γυμνάσιον* attached.

The college stands on a hill on the island of Heybeli (Saddleback) some ten miles out from Istanbul. Grouped round it are the other Princes' Islands—small, irregularly-shaped and wooded—while to the north stretches the bare Chalcedonian coastline, and, to the north-west—"all bright and glittering in the smokeless air"—one can see etched on the horizon the domes and minarets of Constantinople, with Santa Sophia faintly discernible in their midst. Below the school is the village, whose two chief buildings are the Greek church and—within a few hundred yards—a mosque, from whose minaret, we can clearly hear, if the wind is right, the call of the muezzin. The feeling of taking part in ancient Christian rites in a pagan land, whose rulers, moreover, have not always been kind to the minorities, lends an almost early Christian atmosphere to life out here. Yet signs are not wanting of a more enlightened and generous approach from Ankara to peoples of differing religious faiths. A recent example of this is provided by the granting of permission for the traditional Greek ceremony of the Feast of the Epiphany. It is twenty-seven years since one last witnessed these processions led by robed priests to the water's edge; this year the Turkish police "fully co-operated"—to borrow a phrase from a pro-Greek newspaper.

Much of the credit for improving the relations between the two peoples must go to the tact and realism of His Holiness the Ecumenical Patriarch. In his official speeches, the phrase "our country" is ever on his lips, whilst he is very seldom seen in photographs without a Turkish representative honourably close, or a picture of Kemal Atatürk in the background. But not only in the field of diplomacy can one descry his influence: his wisdom and drive are seen on every side out here. It is his achievement, for instance, that a printing-press has recently been installed in the Phanar, by means of which, "Ἀπόστολος Ἀνδρέας" is produced weekly. Again, it is due to

him that every church in Constantinople has now its own Sunday school. Not least, his influence has been felt at Halki.

Last September, when John Maitland-Moir of Cuddesdon and I arrived, extensive renovations to the school buildings were in progress and, to herald in the new academic year, appeared a new Σχολάρχης and four new lecturers, three lately returned from Western European universities, and another from America.

Since last autumn His Holiness has paid visits to the school every few weeks and, as recently as the twenty-seventh of March, he mentioned in the course of an audience, which he had graciously granted to us, that changes for the better had only begun at Halki. (Incidentally, on this occasion, he also told us that the official teaching of English was to be included in the curriculum of the next academic year.) And that he should attach such importance to Halki is understandable when one considers that, except for the Universities of Athens and Salonika, and the Russian college of St. Serge in Paris, there is no other Orthodox centre for higher theological training this side of the Iron Curtain.

Let us glance at the Academy's curriculum. The following subjects are taught: The Introduction to, and exegesis of, the Old and New Testaments; Introduction to Theology; Dogmatics and History of Dogmas[1] Patrology; Principles of expounding Scripture; History of Philosophy; Ecclesiastical Law; Philosophical and Christian Ethics; Church History; Apologetics; Rhetoric (for Sermons); Hebrew and Christian antiquities; Aesthetics; Music; and Gymnastics.[2] This list of subjects (arranged according to the time allotted to each) has a far wider scope than is usual in Anglican theological colleges. Also, the average student at Halki works considerably harder than does his opposite number in England. But when I mentioned to the Principal of an English theological college how extensive was the ground covered, he expressed astonishment but asked, "Have the students time either to think or to read for themselves?" A pertinent question.

The morning of a normal working day commences with ὄρθρος at 7.30, and, after half an hour's break for food, continues with fifty minutes of study and four lectures from 9–12.30. After lunch—where the reading of Photius on the Trinity (of Bishop Buxton's day) has now given way to the Homilies of St. John Chrysostom—there are three more lectures, ἑσπερινός, and an hour and a half's free time. Two and a half hours of study, supper and compline, complete the day.

But although, as can be seen from this, there is some time to read and/or to think, as regards the reading, at any rate, the difficulty is not lack of opportunity, but rather of books; for even though there is a valuable library here, it is at present only open for some six hours a week and contains comparatively few up-to-date theological works. A small students' library does something, but hardly enough to make good this deficiency,

[1] It is noticeable how far the teaching of Dogma consists in the presentation of the relevant passages in the Fathers; and how small a part is played by general or philosophical presuppositions—Scripture and Tradition being thought unquestionable and sufficient.

[2] There is also instruction in Liturgies, History of Religions, and Pastoralia, but not this year.

while books that may be found in Constantinople are always excessively dear. Necessarily, therefore, much time at Halki is spent in the copying-out, the learning and (in the case of at least one professor) the learning by heart, of quantities of notes. Easy access to books is one advantage the English ordinand has over the Greek student at Halki. A second great difference is the omission here of specific teaching about, or time set apart for, private or mental prayer. Also there is little sign of the personal relationship between staff and student to which we, in England, are accustomed, though a few members of the staff are now doing their best to bridge the gulf. Yet a fourth distinction is the absence of emphasis at Halki on pastoral training, although in this connection one must remember that the object of the training is not so much to produce parish priests as church leaders. But perhaps the most immediately striking difference is that while, in Britain, the stress may be primarily on the individual, here it is entirely on the community as a whole.

The students sleep in dormitories; eat the excellent food all together and in silence; from time to time are all medically examined, and have their time carefully and strictly arranged for them. Whatever else a student here may learn he very soon sees the advantage of doing as did Harry Graham's nurse who "kept quiet and kept her place, lyin' low and sayin' nuffin'." The lack of silence and solitude, which is characteristic of Halki, may seem grave disadvantages to English readers; but a situation which might be thought intolerable is entirely saved by the charm of our fellow-students, who, though they come from all kinds of backgrounds, and homes as far apart as Constantinople and Crete, Athens and Imbros, Cyprus and Northern Greece, are alike in their kindliness, understanding and courtesy towards "the stranger within their gate."

Symeon's dictum that truth stands neither in the middle way, nor in one extreme, but in both extremes, seems to me to be applicable to both types of instruction. But each extreme of training has also its dangers. Individualism may easily degenerate into a self-containment perilously close to pride; whilst stress on the community and lack of personal touch may, at worst, be productive of a type of superior sheep, instead of the shepherds the church needs. Certainly Anselm's advice to an abbot sometimes seems apt. "Tell me, my Lord abbot," he wrote, "if you planted a tree in your garden, and tied it up on all sides, . . . what sort of a tree would it turn out when, after some years, you gave it room to spread? . . . If you suit yourselves to your weak and your strong ones, by God's grace, you shall, as far as lies in you, win them all for God."

Yet, criticize the Orthodox instruction as we may, there is one truth they have laid firm hold of (and this undoubtedly the most important truth of all). The church is indeed a focal point of life, and the incomparable three-hour liturgy—sung beautifully by the students—the weekly climax.

In England one senses a cut and driedness about the services and often feels that the only thing that stops the churchgoer from continually glancing at his watch is his good manners; there is none of this breathlessness and timelessness.

Forgive me if I end with a story to illustrate the two approaches. An

American Episcopalian was attending a service on Easter Day at the Orthodox Church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem. The church was full, but at the climax the crowd pressed eagerly forward, leaving a space at the back empty. In this space the American noticed some children begin a game of hide and seek round the pillars, whilst a church official looked on benignly. The Episcopalian approached him and angrily asked him why he did not stop them. "What!" was the astonished reply, "and where may children play if not in their Father's House?"

March 5th, 1952 DAVID WHITAKER.

JERUSALEM AFTER CHALCEDON

A.D. 451—518

IT was with dark forebodings that bishops and monks of Palestine had accompanied the Archbishop Juvenal to Chalcedon. In still darker haste did they return. The monk Theodosius appears to have been the first to arrive, crying out to the imperial lady Eudocia, to the monastic aristocracy of Jerusalem, to Peter the Iberian prince-monk on the Gaza seaboard, and to all and sundry up and down the land, against the treason of Juvenal—Juvenal, who two years before had been hand in glove with Dioscorus at Ephesus, and had now deserted his old ally; Juvenal, who had gone to the council anathematizing the Tome of Leo, and calling on his followers to repudiate him if he ever did otherwise; Juvenal, concerning whom, years before, the priest Pelagius had prophesied on Golgotha that he who then was being led in triumph by the clergy and the monks, would one day be so led by the Romans and the demons.

His inflammatory reports swept the country. With Peter the Iberian, the archimandrite Romanus from Tekoa, and a crowd of monks so great that the governor dared not allow them to enter Cæsarea, he went down to remonstrate with Juvenal on his arrival. The latter, seeing the situation, returned to Constantinople. Theodosius, with Eudocia's support, was raised to the throne of St. James, and set about consecrating other bishops for sees whose rightful occupants had fled or failed to return.

Two of the signatories of the council had also come back "at a run" (says Cyril of Scythopolis). Stephen of Jamnia had been a monk in the laura where Euthymius ruled, eight miles down from Jerusalem into the freedom of the wilderness: John was bishop of the Arab tribe which owed its conversion to the saint. They had signed with Juvenal—but that would not lessen their trepidation. John's predecessor Auxolaus, two years before, had also signed with Juvenal—at the "Robber Council" of Ephesus. Returning, he had died of the saint's displeasure (ἐν ἀγανακτήσει). Now at Chalcedon they had done much more than renounce the Robber Council: they had signed, under considerable pressure, a dogmatic statement whose language was at least unwonted, and accepted the Tome of Leo which Juvenal himself had rejected a few months before: and they had reinstated two bishops who were strongly suspected of Nestorianism. They brought down the definition to Euthymius in fear lest they also should fall under his displeasure (δεδιότες μὴ ἀγανακτηθῶσιν).

But forty years and more in that bony wilderness had given Euthymius a longer and a calmer and clearer view than was common in the tense atmosphere of the city. He was not concerned with the manner in which the council was carried through—only with the orthodoxy of the document which bore his clients' signature. And this he found unexceptionable. So when Theodosius's envoys, Elpidius and Gerontius—the recognized heads of the monks of Jerusalem—came down to seek his support for the intruder, they found here at least a rock unshakable on which the waves of Theodosius's fanaticism broke in vain. And one of the two, Elpidius (successor of the great Passarion), though he did not yet break with Theodosius, was in fact convinced by Euthymius's defence of the Chalcedonian formula. Already the tide begins to turn in favour of the council.

Theodosius continued his pressure until Euthymius took refuge in the farther desert towards the Dead Sea. Thither came others also, from both sides, fleeing from the turmoil of the times in search of the true monastic quiet. Not a few opponents of the council among them were gradually won over by the saint's calm reasoning—notable among them the Lycian Gerasimus, whose monastery in the Jordan Plain represents a somewhat different monastic tradition from that of the mountainous wilderness.

It was well on in A.D. 353 when Juvenal returned with imperial force to recover his throne. Theodosius, whose usurpation appears not to have been altogether peaceful from the first, now offered armed resistance, and was defeated in something like a pitched battle fought at Nablus between his monks and the Roman troops, who for once had Samaritan support.

The execrated Juvenal had achieved the kernel of his ambition—not indeed the supremacy of Jerusalem over Antioch which he had claimed at the First Council of Ephesus, and apparently been allowed at the brigandage; but at least the independent authority of his see over the three provinces of Palestine, accepted by Maximus of Antioch, which established Jerusalem in its position, recognized ever since, as the Fifth Patriarchate of Christendom. But it was a chastened Juvenal who returned. The monophysite writers themselves show him dignified, humble, and generous, in the face of the repeated insults heaped upon him by the opponents of the council. Not unnaturally, the prime movers of the revolt were exiled—Theodosius himself fled, but was finally caught at the gate of Antioch disguised as a soldier, and confined in a monastery in Constantinople (though the Emperor appears to have done his best to conciliate him first). He died at Galata shortly after the accession of Leo in A.D. 457. The bishops intruded by him were removed. Peter the Iberian, whom he had consecrated Bishop of Maiouma, went voluntarily into Egypt, where he was rebuked from heaven for "cutting" an old friend who had accepted the council. Romanus (whose leading part in the revolt, ignored by Cyril of Scythopolis, becomes clear from monophysite sources) was relegated to Antioch. Gerontius, we are told, experienced bonds and imprisonment, and was brought before judges. But the bulk of the opposition appears to have remained undisturbed.

No doubt they had the protection of Eudocia, who still held aloof from the council. But the tragic events to her offspring in Italy in A.D. 455, and

a series of letters from the Pope and her kinsfolk, caused her to think again. She chose a "neutral" cleric, the chorepiscop Anastasius (another disciple of Passarion), to submit her doubts to St. Symeon the Stylite, who referred her back to the saint at her doors—to Euthymius. And under his somewhat begrudged instruction, she was reunited to Juvenal and the established Church, bringing Elpidius and a crowd of monks and laity in her train, and appealing to other recalcitrants and exiles to do likewise. Gerontius on the Mount of Olives remained obdurate—perhaps it was now that, intreated at least to consent to *meet* Juvenal, if not to communicate with him, he answered "God forbid that I should see the face of Judas the traitor." Marcian left the community of Elpidius to found his own cœnobium near Bethlehem. Romanus wrote to Eudocia from Antioch to describe how, when news of Chalcedon had first arrived, and the monks had resorted to him at Tekoa as their common father, he had withdrawn into the wilderness for prayer, and had at last, on his third withdrawal, extracted from heaven an unambiguous anathema on the council.

But at least Juvenal felt strong enough, now, to join with Eudocia in an appeal to the Emperor for an amnesty for Romanus and the other exiles—an appeal which seems to have been successful, though it is not clear whether there was time for it to be put into effect before the death of the Emperor Marcian early in A.D. 457. In any case Romanus was returned well before the death of Juvenal, which appears to have occurred on July 1st, A.D. 459. But embarrassed by the fact that his Tekoan monastery lay in the diocese of Jerusalem, and therefore directly under the jurisdiction of Juvenal, and because bad men were disturbing the peace of the neighbouring village, he transferred himself to a hill-top to the west of Eleutheropolis, on a property belonging to Eudocia, who, in spite of her acceptance of Chalcedon, persuaded him to build there a great and beautiful monastery.

The easing of tension in Jerusalem at this time was endorsed by the new Emperor, Leo, who was prepared to raise the whole question of Chalcedon afresh. Even when the Egyptian monophysites, in the first months of his reign, taking the law into their own hands, consecrated a successor (Timothy "the Cat") to Dioscorus dead in exile, and murdered the Chalcedonian Patriarch Proterius, he was unwilling to act without consulting the universal episcopate. And Pope St. Leo himself was not unready to be conciliatory, writing a letter to the Emperor which, while safeguarding Orthodoxy, avoided the phrases in dispute. Timothy refused all conciliation, but he remained in possession of his see for three years. It was only in A.D. 460 that he was sent into exile and replaced by a very moderate and gentle Chalcedonian. It was in accordance with the spirit of the time that, on Juvenal's death, the "neutral" Anastasius was raised, "by the vote of the whole people," to the throne of St. James.

The last years of Juvenal had seen a considerable influx to the Holy City of young aspirants to the monastic life, including many of the future champions of Orthodoxy. Theodosius, the future cœnobiarch, and Theognius had both arrived, and sought out Chalcedonian tutors, when the opponents of the council were still predominant in the monasteries of Jeru-

salem and of the wilderness. Sabas, in the autumn of A.D. 456, had joined himself first to the monastery of St. Passarion when its abbot, Elpidius, had only recently returned to the Patriarch's communion. It was with Elpidius's blessing that he went on, the following year, to seek the guidance of Euthymius. The disturbances in Egypt in the same year (A.D. 457) seem to have occasioned a considerable exodus of peace-loving monks to Palestine. The two future patriarchs, Martyrius and Elias, came from Nitria to St. Euthymius. In the anti-Chalcedonian connection, it was probably at an earlier date that the great ascetic teacher and writer, Abba Esaias, came from Scetis first to Eleutheropolis and then to the Gaza region.

Little is recorded of the general history of the Church in Palestine during the remaining years of the Emperor Leo. Euthymius showed a suggestive reserve towards Anastasius, respectfully excusing himself from receiving a visit from the Patriarch, and only meeting him at the funeral of his friend Theoctistus, at his Lower Monastery in the Wady Mukellik in A.D. 466. Anastasius, on the other hand, showed marked attention to the saint, and on his death in A.D. 473, came down twice to the Laura for his obsequies. The important office of "Keeper of the Cross" was throughout his patriarchate occupied by disciples of Euthymius. But Gerontius on Olivet and Marcian at Bethlehem remained centres of strong opposition to the council. Romanus flourished near Eleutheropolis. And Peter the Iberian, returning to Palestine during these years, seems to have conducted successful propaganda up and down the land. The publication of the Encyclical of the usurper Basiliscus in A.D. 475, with its clear anathema on Chalcedon, strengthened the hands of this party, whose power grew to be such that Anastasius not only accepted the Encyclical, but appears to have refused assent to its withdrawal shortly afterwards in the "Antencyclical" which, with no express mention of Chalcedon, proclaimed a return to the "status quo." When Anastasius died in A.D. 478, and was succeeded by Martyrius, whose old connection with St. Euthymius may have been remembered against him, Gerontius and the opponents of the Synod, relying still on the Encyclical, threatened violent revolt, and it seemed clear that something must be done.

Cyril of Scythopolis tells us how Martyrius wrote rather too freely (παρρησιαστικώτερον) to the Emperor Zeno and the Patriarch Acacius of Constantinople, sending the letters by the deacon Fidus. Fidus was shipwrecked on the way, and in answer to his cry for help, Euthymius appeared to him on the sea, with the words of the angel to Balaam, "Thy way is not comely (οὐκ ἀστεία ἡ ὁδός σου) before God"—Fidus's journey to Constantinople would not bring profit to the Mother of Churches: let him go back and tell Martyrius to have no anxiety about the Aposchists; for complete union would be coming from the Lord in a few days, and in his hierarchy there would be in Jerusalem one flock under one shepherd. Miraculously, Fidus found himself back in Jerusalem. He reported to the Patriarch, then set to work, in obedience to the saint's command, to carry through the conversion of his Laura into a cœnobium—a process which was completed in three years, so that Martyrius could come down to consecrate the new Church on May 7th, A.D. 482. Meanwhile, the saint's

promise had been fulfilled. "A few days" after Fidus's return, Marcian, the leader of the Aposchists, had called them together at Bethlehem, and proposed to cast lots as between the bishops and the monks, "and if the lot go to the monks, let us remain as we are: but if to the bishops, let us enter into communion with the Church." The lot fell for the bishops, and the whole company with one consent came into the Holy City and were received by the Archbishop, and all the lights of the Holy Anastasis were lit for the great festival of reunion. Only Gerontius and Romanus remained in opposition.

Cyril does not, however, reveal that any conditions were attached to this reunion. But in Syriac translation, in the works of the monophysite historian Zacharias Scholasticus, we find what appears evidently to be Martyrius's speech on this occasion. It contains an anathema on every one who holds any other doctrine than that of Nicæa, "wherever it arose, whether at Ariminum or at Sardica or at Chalcedon or at any other place." The words are equivalent to those of the Henotikon of Zeno, "And we anathematize every one who thinks or has thought otherwise either now or ever before, either at Chalcedon or in any synod whatsoever." It seems clear that Martyrius in A.D. 479, yielding to apparent necessities, had set the pattern for a compromise which was to be followed in A.D. 482 by Zeno and Acacius, in a formula which cast a slur on the Council of Chalcedon without expressly condemning it. This was the line to be adopted in the Eastern Empire as the basis of policy for over thirty years in an effort to unite all moderate men without enforcing the terms of a document which was genuinely regarded as suspect. Passions were running high, and it was extremely doubtful whether any real difference of faith lay behind the conflicting terms. Men must be given time to think.

In Palestine at least, as a temporary expedient, the policy was not ineffective. A man like Marcian, who after many years of opposition to the council, had hardly been brought to accept the compromise, quickly found himself in close friendship and confident co-operation with convinced Chalcedonians like Theodosius and Sabas (who established their two great monasteries within the next ten years). A more articulate unity of faith would follow in due course.

Cyril and Zacharias agree that Martyrius expelled those who did not accept the union.

Cyril, who speaks of Marcian's reconciliation as "the Second Union" (implying that the First was the reconciliation of Eudocia and Elpidius), says that Gerontius was expelled at this time from Olivet, and Romanus from Tekoa. But Romanus had certainly gone to his Eleutheropolis monastery (where he died in peace) twenty years before. And Gerontius cannot have long survived the event. Cyril also tells us of the expulsion at this time of two monophysite monks who had succeeded to the tower on Jebel Muntar, where Eudocia had received the instruction of Euthymius (yet another hint that, in her reconciliation with Juvenal, she did not break off all her connections with the recalcitrants). It would appear that opposition to Martyrius was silenced in Jerusalem—Peter the Iberian, spending one summer about now (perhaps A.D. 482) on an old property of Eudocia's five

miles out, would not enter the Holy City even by night. But in the Philistine Plain, and at Eleutheropolis, the opponents of compromise held their ground. At the same time, in Palestine at least, such evidence as we have seems to show little bitterness between the parties—the Henoticists conciliatory, the Aposchists courteous. And perhaps sometimes personal loyalties played a larger part than deep-set doctrinal convictions. The great Abba Esaias was attached to the Aposchist party. But when questioned by two Chalcedonian monks, he shocked and embarrassed his disciple, Peter the Egyptian, by telling them that there was no harm in the Synod, and they were very well as they were. It was no doubt for ascetic reasons, rather than out of intransigence, that he and Peter the Iberian avoided compliance, in A.D. 487, with Zeno's summons to conversations in Constantinople. A monophysite, writing in the last years of Anastasius, when passions were once more aroused, could look back to these decades as a time when the schism was regarded by the people of the Churches as one between brethren, and not deeply affecting the Faith.

Martyrius died in April, A.D. 486. At one with the policy of Acacius of Constantinople, he had accepted the synodicals both of Peter Mongus of Alexandria and of Peter the Fuller of Antioch. But we have no sufficient ground for classing him, as is often done (*pace* the evidence of Cyril of Scythopolis), among the confirmed enemies of Chalcedon. His successor, Sallust, appears to have followed the same policy, though we know little of him. He appears to have supported the Patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch against the Chalcedonian Euphemius of Constantinople under the new Emperor Anastasius. And we should not pay great heed to the statement of the Jacobite historian, Michael the Syrian, that he "separated and was with Rome"—though we should like to know its origin. But it was he who ordained Sabas to the priesthood in A.D. 490, and appointed first Marcian, then on his death (in November, A.D. 492) Theodosius and Sabas, to be archimandrites over all the monks of the wilderness. Their appointment suggests a move in the Chalcedonian direction which becomes more marked when on Sallust's death in June, A.D. 494, his successor Elias comes out clearly for Euphemius, breaking thereby both with Alexandria and with Antioch at a time when the Patriarchs of both these sees were openly anathematizing Chalcedon, and the religious emperor Anastasius, though in policy striving to adhere to the *via media* of the Henotikon, could not conceal his personal monophysite convictions. Rome was holding aloof in the West because of the Henotikon. And the Emperor was working to get rid of Euphemius from Constantinople. So Elias's stand was taken at a moment when it looked as if his Church might soon find itself as a result in complete isolation. Actually, when Euphemius was extruded in A.D. 496, his successor, Macedonius, proved equally Chalcedonian in conviction—so that Elias accepted his synodicals, while not thereby assenting to the deposition of his predecessor. And when, not more than two years later, Flavian succeeded Palladius at Antioch, and refused the demand of John of Alexandria for an anathema on the council, three out of the four Eastern patriarchates were united on the Chalcedonian side, against the desire of the Emperor. But for ten years a truce continued on the lines of the Henotikon,

the Patriarchs not demanding positive subscription to the council, nor the Emperor an anathema thereon. Alexandria, while accepting the Henotikon as a sop to the Emperor, was out of communion with the other Patriarchates.

Meanwhile Sabas was "making a city of the wilderness," planting his disciples on cliff-side and hill-top up and down that stark land. In a few years the numbers of the monks who looked to him and Theodosius as their leaders began to assume Egyptian proportions. It was an international crowd, as was to be expected in the Holy Land: and several languages—Greek, Armenian,[1] Bessic, Syriac, etc.—could be heard in liturgical use alongside each other in the churches of a single monastery. Thus they were saved from provincialism. And, while the desert bound them to eternity, the cities of the Incarnation along the western sky-line above them kept them wedded to history. Here, if anywhere on earth, was a force to which one would look for a true balance of Orthodoxy. The story is told of the Egyptian monk John, who during this period founded the monastery of Chouziba in the Wady Qelt, and later became Archbishop of Cæsarea (but finally returned to his monastery), how he was supernaturally prevented from approaching the Holy Sepulchre until he had renounced his opposition to the council.

But the opposition around Gaza and Eleutheropolis continued to hold its own. Here also a new generation had arisen, its core a group of former law students from Beirut, who had taken the habit about A.D. 490, within a short time of the death of the old leaders, Peter the Iberian and the Abba Esaias. Outstanding among these was Severus.

Trouble began about A.D. 508. Nephalius, a fire-brand monk who had roused extreme monophysite opposition against Peter Mongus in Alexandria in A.D. 486, now appeared on the Chalcedonian side in Palestine, expelling, or threatening to expel, the Aposchist monks from their monasteries on the Gaza sea-board. Severus was sent as their representative to Constantinople to appeal to the Emperor. No doubt his legal training stood him in good stead. And he had friends at court. He stayed for three years in the imperial city. And he did a great deal more than get his friends restored to their monasteries. He appears to have attained a complete personal ascendancy over the Emperor which was to alter the course of the remaining years of his reign. Working at high pressure in writing and speaking, fervent in faith and quite unscrupulous in method, he spread his propaganda around the court, setting the stage for the Emperor's expulsion of the Patriarch Macedonius in August, A.D. 511. The monophysite party hoped to get Severus himself as his successor. But the temper of the populace of the city made this clearly impossible. Though a known monophysite, Timothy, was in fact installed, he did not dare, even with the Emperor's support, openly to anathematize Chalcedon—so that Flavian and Elias, while they could not approve the deposition of Macedonius, found Timothy's synodicals unexceptionable. Severus returned to his

[1] When Sabas found that some of the Armenians in his Laura were introducing the monophysite addition into the Trisagion when they sang it in their own language, he ordered that that hymn should be sung in Greek.

monastery—though not for long. His opinion of Timothy is expressed in his letters.

Elias foresaw that the Emperor would now bring pressure to bear on himself and Flavian, and that this would inevitably upset the peace of the Church in Jerusalem. Knowing Anastasius's reverence for monks, he sent Sabas, in the autumn of A.D. 411, to look after his interests at court through the coming winter. While Sabas was still on his way, a synod was convoked on the Emperor's orders at Sidon, where Philoxenus of Mabbug, who had long been working to oust Flavian, strove (with Severus in support) to obtain from him and Elias either an anathema on Chalcedon, or something that would embroil them with the Emperor. But the two Patriarchs outwitted their adversaries, and the synod was dismissed having accomplished nothing —though Elias did at this time go to the extreme of concession in writing to the Emperor that he rejected every heresy that introduces any novelty against the Orthodox faith, "not accepting (*οὐ προσιέμενοι*) even the things done in Chalcedon because of the scandals that have arisen therefrom." Philoxenus and his friends sent violent reports to Anastasius, but Sabas was in fact able to appease for the time being the Emperor's angry suspicions in regard to Elias.

Sabas won another victory at this time which greatly strengthened the Orthodox position in Palestine. Mamas was archimandrite of Romanus's monastery by Eleutheropolis, and had been, it seems, one of Severus's early instructors in the monastic life. He had come up to Constantinople with Severus, but had quarrelled with him there.[2] Sabas, returning to Jerusalem in May, A.D. 512, took Mamas with him to Elias, and persuaded him to accept Chalcedon and Catholic communion. Many others followed his example—though the monastery of Romanus seems itself to have remained in the hands of Severus's party.

Meanwhile in Syria, Philoxenus and his friends were able to stir up trouble which led to Flavian's deposition and exile to Petra. Severus was elected in his place, and brought by imperial command from his Gaza retreat to occupy the throne of Antioch (November, A.D. 512). He immediately sent out synodicals anathematizing Chalcedon. When Elias rejected these, Severus reported to the Emperor, then sent the same synodicals again to Jerusalem, in May, A.D. 513, with some clerics and an imperial escort. This time Sabas and the other monastic leaders came up and drove the bearers of the synodicals out of the Holy City. They assembled the whole multitude of the monks, with the people of Jerusalem, before Calvary, and there, in the presence of the officers and soldiers of the escort, all cried out "Anathema on Severus and those who hold communion with him."

The show of force won the Patriarch a respite. Anastasius seems genuinely to have tried to avoid bloodshed in religious strife. Moreover, he

[2] Severus would seem to have been one of those who can both attract passionate loyalty from their followers and cause bitter disillusionment. Zacharias the Scholasticus had been a friend of his from student days, and wrote a biographical dialogue in his defence, while he was still in possession at Antioch. But the tolerance and gentleness shown in this work is in sharp contrast with the character shown in Severus's own letters. And herein we may find the explanation how the convinced monophysite Zacharias could later become Chalcedonian Bishop of Mitylene. In both his case and that of Mamas, the discovery of the things of which Severus was capable may well have wrought the change.

was soon fully occupied with the revolt of Vitalian, and then (in accordance with the terms concluded with Vitalian) with abortive negotiations with Rome for union; then with the renewed revolt of Vitalian, who was only defeated at the end of A.D. 515. Meanwhile the violence of the monophysite rule in Syria (it did not represent the bulk of the population) was increasing. Palestine became a refuge for those who, like Julian, bishop of Bostra, went into exile rather than accept Severus. Jerusalem was once more standing alone among the Eastern Patriarchates. The monastic leaders looked round for support from outside, and sent a long account of the situation (quoted extensively by Evagrius) to Alcison of Nicopolis, the leader of the Epirote bishops who at this time were appealing to the Pope against the monophysite Archbishop of Thessalonica.

At last in A.D. 516 the Emperor felt strong enough to act again according to his convictions. The Epirote bishops were summoned to Constantinople, where Alcison died. And the Duke of Palestine, Olympus of Cæsarea, was sent, armed with Elias's "œconomic" letter from the time of the Council of Sidon, to remove the Patriarch by hook or by crook. Olympus produced the letter—no doubt to embroil its writer with his more uncompromising monastic followers—and Elias was carried off into exile at Aila (Aqaba). John, a deacon of the Anastasis, was installed in his place on September 1st, having promised to anathematize Chalcedon and accept Severus's communion. But when it came to the point he dared not carry out his promise in face of the monastic host. On hearing this, the Emperor removed Olympus, and sent Anastasius, son of Pamphilus, in his place as Duke, to obtain John's submission. The Duke, taking John unawares, placed him in the public prison—to the delight of the people, who regarded him as a traitor to Elias who had ordained him. John, in his dilemma, adopted the ruse secretly proposed to him by the civil governor, Zacharias. He offered to do what was required of him on the coming Sunday provided he was released from prison two days before, so that he should not appear to be acting under compulsion. Emerging on these terms, he sent messages during the night to assemble the monks. And when the Sunday came, a crowd of some ten thousand was gathered at the great Church of St. Stephen —no church inside the walls was large enough for such a multitude—to welcome the Emperor's nephew, Hypatius. The outcome was inevitable. When John mounted the ambon Theodosius and Sabas were on either side of him. The protracted cries of the vast assembly demanded anathema on the heretics, and ratification of the Council. The three with one voice proclaimed anathema on Nestorius, Eutyches, Severus and Soterichus, and all who did not accept Chalcedon. When they came down from the ambon, Theodosius (who was by now well over eighty years old) turned back to add, "If any does not accept the Four Councils even as the Four Gospels, let him be anathema."

The Duke fled to Cæsarea. Hypatius hastily persuaded the fathers of his orthodoxy—he had not communicated with Severus, but had come eager to receive their communion.

Anastasius, on receiving the news, prepared to send force to banish John and Theodosius and Sabas. When this became known in Jerusalem the whole concourse of the monks of the Holy City and its wilderness and the

Jordan sent a lengthy letter of protest to the Emperor, which is preserved in full by Cyril of Scythopolis in the Life of St. Sabas, and in part by Theodore of Petra in his panegyric on St. Theodosius—Christ had entrusted the empire to Anastasius, wishing to bring the great blessing of peace to all the Churches, but especially to Sion the Mother of All Churches, wherein the great mystery of true religion had been manifested and fulfilled for the world's salvation, and beginning from Jerusalem had, through the divine and evangelical preaching, brought to dawn upon all the ends of the earth the light of truth. "Of this precious and surpassing mystery of Christ all we dwellers in this Holy Land have, by the precious Cross the giver of victory, and by the Life-giving Anastasis, and indeed by all the Holy Places which we venerate, kept, and by Grace of God will keep for ever, intact and unassailed in Christ, the true and unimaginary confession and faith which we have received from of old and from the beginning, handed down through the blessed and holy Apostles." How was it that now, under Anastasius, Sion the Mother of All Churches, and the Holy Anastasius of our God and Saviour, the refuge and sanctuary of all those from all the world who suffer wrong and need salvation, was being turned into a public market and common place, bishops and clergy and monks being thrust with violence out of Holy Sion and the Anastasis, in the sight of gentiles and Jews and Samaritans, and dragged through the midst of the city to profane and unclean places, and compelled to do things to the hurt of the Faith, so that pilgrims who came for prayer and edification were going home to their own countries scandalized? If it was for the sake of the Faith that all these things were being moved against the Holy City of God, Jerusalem, the eye and luminary of all the world, which received the word of the Gospel—the dwellers therein were daily as it were with their own hands handling the Truth by means of those same venerable places wherein the mystery of the Incarnation of our great God and Saviour was performed—"How then, after five hundred years and more since the Advent of the Christ, are we men of Jerusalem *learning* the Faith?" Clearly the "correction" now being made to the Faith was not of Christ but of Antichrist. Severus was the source of all the trouble. If life and death were in the scale in a matter of Faith they would choose death. Ten thousand deaths would not persuade the dwellers in the Holy Land to be united to any who did not follow the unique and apostolic Faith which had come down to them through the Four Councils. The blood of all of them would gladly be poured out, and all the Holy Places consumed with fire, before any such thing should take place in this Holy City of God.

By the time the letter was sent, Timothy of Constantinople had already died and been succeeded by John (April, A.D. 518). Anastasius, again preoccupied with trouble from Vitalian, sent to Theodosius a somewhat evasive disclaimer of responsibility for the troubles, inveighing against those who make the mystery no mystery.

But his time was short. He died during a violent thunderstorm on the night of July 9th–10th. Elias, whom Sabas was visiting at Aila, revealed to his guests what had happened, and prophesied his own death ten days later—on July 20th (the day kept in the Eastern Church as the Feast of the Prophet Elias). Flavian of Antioch had at Petra the same knowledge. The

two Patriarchs sent messages to each other—"Anastasius has died to-day. Let us also go, that we may be judged with him."

On August 6th the synod of bishops of Palestine, with Sabas and a vast crowd of monks and laity, gathered in festival at Jerusalem to receive the orders of the new Emperor Justin, and to inscribe in the diptychs the Four Councils.

From the moment when Severus was raised to the throne of Antioch, the policy of the Henotikon had been proved bankrupt—there was no middle way left between acceptance and rejection of Chalcedon. Once more, it might seem, Rome's long and lonely stand for the strict Catholic Faith had been vindicated. But is that the whole truth? Whatever names might be omitted from the diptychs for the sake of unity, Eastern Orthodox Christendom could never really believe that men who had died in exile for the faith of Chalcedon—Euphemius and Macedonius, Flavian and Elias—had died outside Catholic communion, or that the Church of the Eastern Patriarchates had ceased to be the Catholic Church during the ambiguous period of the Henotikon—a very fruitful period for the Church in many fields, and pregnant for the future.[3] And the gradual process which culminated in the moment when successors of Marcian and of Romanus stood beside Sabas and Theodosius to proclaim Chalcedon against the Emperor, surely bears the stamp of the Holy Spirit's working *within* the Church.

It was not just political necessity that drove convinced Chalcedonians to offer and accept the Henotikon, but a real sense that, while the colder intellectual distinctions are vital to the Faith of the Church, there was something on the other side—the warm devotion of opponents of the council to Christ our Brother, God who died for us—which belonged rightly to the Church, and need not and must not be lost. Chalcedon was right; but the terms of its balance were unwonted. Rome's clear stand for the Faith authoritatively proclaimed was admirable; but it offered no bridge to those other sheep. The Eastern Chalcedonian was ready, without losing his own conviction, to come down to the level of their uncertainty. The authority of the council was not diminished by its having to bide its time until it found its confirmation in the hearts of the faithful. And perhaps the Eastern was always more deeply conscious of the inadequacy of all definition. His appeal was to Jerusalem, as to the Heart of History and of the Church's prayer. In such an appeal there must be no hasty seeking for an answer to our questions—no listening to voices, "Lo, here is Christ," or "Lo, there." This oracle speaks most often by silence. But when its voice is heard it is like the lightning which shines from one end of the heavens to the other. For it speaks from the inmost heart of every Christian.

D. J. CHITTY.

[3] E.g., Sabas's organization during these years of the Judæan wilderness is one of the primary influences in Eastern Orthodox Monasticism. Romanus's great outpouring of Christian song began under Anastasius. And the Church did not shrink from adopting to herself the labours and inventions of opponents of the council during this period. It was Peter the Fuller who introduced the regular recitation of the Creed in the Liturgy. Orthodox monks of the circle of Barsanuphius and John, in the next generation, dwelling by Gaza on a site once occupied by Peter the Iberian, were not ashamed to recognize their debt to the Abba Esaias, whose manner of solitary life they copied, and whose ascetic works (which they constantly quote) survive in Greek as well as in Syriac. And surely there has been profit as well as danger in the vast influence on the Church of the pseudo-Areopagitic writings palmed off upon her by Severus.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY THE FAITH PRESS, LTD., LEIGHTON BUZZARD